

3→2 Advancement, Beneficiary Advancement, and *With*

Author(s): Robert Channon

Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1982), pp. 271-282

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

3→2 ADVANCEMENT, BENEFICIARY ADVANCEMENT, AND WITH

Robert Channon
University of Chicago

Sentence pairs like that illustrated in 1, which are usually said to be related to each other by a rule of DATIVE MOVEMENT or INDIRECT OBJECT MOVEMENT in Transformational Grammar, following Fillmore's 1965 treatment of them, are analyzed in Relational Grammar as being related by the rule of 3→2 ADVANCEMENT.

1a. Sally gave the book to Bill.

1b. Sally gave Bill the book.

3→2 ADVANCEMENT, formulated by Perlmutter and Postal (1974) in a paper presented at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society and in other lectures, is a rule which advances a 3 (Indirect Object) to 2 (Direct Object) in the hierarchy of relations between nominal arguments and their predicates. In so doing it displaces the initial 2, causing it to become a 2-chômeur ($\hat{2}$) and to cease being or functioning as the 2. The labels on the arguments in 1 sum up the change in structure which takes place. The case for 3→2 ADVANCEMENT has been made quite strongly by Perlmutter and Postal and in other places (e.g., Chung 1976, Channon 1978), and no further argumentation will be given here. I will, instead, concentrate on an apparently unsystematic idiosyncrasy of 3→2 ADVANCEMENT and on a closely related rule of BENEFICIARY ADVANCEMENT.

The idiosyncrasy concerns not the core of the rule (the promotion of the 3 to 2 and consequent displacement of the initial 2 from that function), but rather the so-called "side effects" (attendant changes in word order, verbal markings and nominal markings which may be occasioned by the application of a rule). As can be seen from example 1, in English there is no change in verbal markings as a result of this rule, but there is a change in word order (the new 2 moves to the position immediately following the main verb, the spot which is reserved for and which is characteristic of 2s in English).¹ Examining the markings of the nominals affected by the rule, we find that the 3 loses its characteristic marker *to* and has no marker, like other 2s in the language, and that the 2-chômeur does not acquire any overt marker. But the problem here is that in other pairs of sentences which seem to be related by the same rule, there can be different side effects, cf. 2a and 2b; note also the ungrammaticality of 1c and 2c.

2a. Our firm supplies coats to the army.

2b. Our firm supplies the army with coats.

1c. *Sally gave Bill with the book.

2c. ?*Our firm supplies the army \emptyset coats.²

In the sentences of 2, as in 1, there is no change in verbal markings, the expected change in word order takes place, and the 3 loses its marker; but in this example, unlike in the previous one, the 2-chômeur does get a marker, the preposition *with*. The advancement thus does not seem to operate in a uniform way, at least with respect to the treatment of the chômeur created, which is a somewhat suspicious circumstance; it becomes even more so when compared to advancements in other languages or to other advancements in English, which, in general, seem to have uniform effects whenever they apply. This lack of uniformity was recognized by Perlmutter and Postal themselves, and they were forced to say that side effects of advancements (or, at least, certain side effects of this advancement in English) were not just rule-specific, but could be idiosyncratic to the lexical items that are marked for undergoing the advancement. While such a statement accounts for the facts, it is not very satisfying on the explanatory level (and even seems to run counter to the usual situation found with other advancement phenomena, as noted above), and this weakness has been used as an argument against the 3→2 analysis. Aside from being an argument against the 3→2 analysis in general, it could also be used as an argument that there are really two different advancements of 3→2 involved here (and that would engender a host of other problems, since there would not appear to be any difference in the environments for the two advancements); further, it could be wondered whether there were not still more varieties of 3→2 advancement with additional forms of chômeur marking or other differences in side effects, or even whether other advancements might not also cover domains which included corresponding idiosyncracies. Any of these possibilities would, at least to a degree, call into question the 3→2 analysis. In the remainder of this paper I will attempt to show that the occurrence of *with* is not unpredictable in those cases of 3→2 ADVANCEMENT in which it appears, and that it can be determined by reference to the subcategorization or case frame of the predicate. In a sense, then, the appearance of *with* as the chômeur marker is a fact about certain lexical items, as noted by Perlmutter and Postal, but, to the extent that this fact is correlated with other, independently arrived at facts about these lexical items, it ceases to be ad hoc.

To begin with, we must consider the role of Beneficiary arguments and the distinction between Beneficiary and Recipient arguments.³ Adequate diagnostics for these and most other argument types do not exist, and so the terms are applied somewhat loosely here. "Beneficiary" will be used to designate that argument in the initial structure for whose benefit an action is performed; in English, if its relation has not been changed in the course of derivation, it appears on the surface with the marker *for*, in the meaning 'for the benefit of.' It can, however, be promoted by an advancement rule, and so may appear in the surface structure as the bearer of other relations and with other markers. "Recipient" will be used to designate that argument in the initial structure which is the receiver (animate Goal, in the terms of Fillmore 1971)

of the Patient moved or affected by the verb, regardless of whether or not that argument also represents the beneficiary of the action.⁴ The Recipient normally appears in the initial level of syntactic structure as a 3, just as, in Nominative-Accusative languages, the Patient normally becomes the initial 2 and the Agent becomes the initial 1. If this initial relation is left undisturbed, the Recipient will appear on the surface as a 3, and in English will have the marker *to*; it, too, however, is subject to promotion (e.g., by 3→2 ADVANCEMENT), and so may appear as the bearer of other relations and with other markers. An example of a sentence with both a Recipient and a Beneficiary, showing clearly that they are separate arguments, is given in 1d, where the underlying Recipient appears as a surface 3.

- 1d. Sally gave the book to Bill for his children.
¹ Sally ² gave the book to ³ Bill for his children. BEN

In English, some verbs, like *sell*, may take only a Recipient from among the two arguments under consideration here;⁵ others, like *buy*, may, at least overtly, take only a Beneficiary. (Since *buy* contains a deictic component which has the meaning that the action must be directed toward the initial 1 [underlying Agent], the notion of Recipient is already incorporated, and no Recipient can be or need be expressed; the Beneficiary, however, may be expressed, since it is not built into the meaning of the verb.⁶) Still other verbs may allow both a Recipient and a Beneficiary; among these, some, like *reward*, may require that the two arguments be the same (or, at least, coreferential),⁷ while others, like *give*, may permit them to be the same (and this may in fact be the usual case), but may also allow them to be different. As a general pragmatic principle of interpretation for verbs which can have both arguments, but where only one is mentioned, the Recipient and the Beneficiary are normally construed as being the same (or coreferential) unless it is otherwise specified or made clear from the context that they are not (cf. 1a and 1d above). Beneficiaries, like other arguments, may be promoted by advancement rules, as can be seen in the sentences of 3, which illustrate a verb with BEN and its possibility of advancing to 2.

- 3a. Harry bought the book for Elaine.
¹ Harry ² bought the book for ³ Elaine. BEN
- 3b. Harry bought Elaine the book.
¹ Harry ² bought ³ Elaine the book. BEN
- 3c. *Harry bought Elaine with the book.
¹ Harry ² bought ³ Elaine with the book. BEN
- 3d. Harry bought Elaine with the book.
¹ Harry ² bought ³ Elaine with the book. INSTR
- 3e. *Harry bought the book to Elaine.
¹ Harry ² bought the book to ³ Elaine. BEN
- 3f. *Harry bought the book to Elaine for Alice.
¹ Harry ² bought the book to ³ Elaine for ⁴ Alice. BEN
- 3g. *Harry bought Alice the book to Elaine.
¹ Harry ² bought ³ Alice the book to ⁴ Elaine. BEN
- 3h. *Harry bought Elaine the book for Alice.
¹ Harry ² bought ³ Elaine the book for ⁴ Alice. BEN

there is also a similar and related sentence, 8h.

- 8h. Cuba¹ supplies arms to El Salvador². (El Salvador³ is the Recipient and also the Beneficiary)

A word about the form of 8h is in order here. I have been arguing that *supply* requires a Beneficiary argument, and that in the sentences of 8 El Salvador is a Beneficiary, but have also said that the Beneficiary is marked with *for*, while the Recipient normally succeeds to the relation 3 and is thus marked with *to*. In 8h, however, the putative Beneficiary is marked with *to*. One possible explanation for this is that there is a rule of BEN→3 ADVANCEMENT which may apply with some verbs if there is not already a 3 in the sentence.¹¹ But 8h does not really have the same meaning as 8d, i.e., it does not simply have a Beneficiary which has been advanced to 3. In 8d we are told that Cuba supplies arms which are intended for El Salvador, but there is no suggestion that they are actually received by El Salvador, or, at least, that Cuba has anything to do with their being sent or received; in 8h, on the other hand, it is clear that the arms are received by El Salvador, i.e., that El Salvador in 8d appears only in the role of Beneficiary, while in 8h it has both the role of Beneficiary and the role of Recipient. It thus seems more appropriate to treat 8h as having both a Recipient and a Beneficiary, which in this sentence are the same or coreferential. In that event, we can easily explain the absence of the concrete instantiation of one of the two identical arguments by coreferential deletion. Such deletion is, of course, a syntactic matter, and thus, in spite of the fact that semantically the Beneficiary is more central to the meaning of this verb than the Recipient, it is syntactically the BEN which is deleted under coreference with the 3, and not vice versa, since 3s outrank BENs and other non-terms in the hierarchy of syntactic relations.¹² Thus, in 8h, while *El Salvador* represents both the Beneficiary and the Recipient, it appears in the sentence only as a 3 (i.e., in the form of the Recipient).

We are now in a position to try to isolate the circumstances which call forth the marker *with* for the 2-chômeur of 3→2 ADVANCEMENT. The examples in 5, 6, 7, and 8 below present sets of sentences which show the possibilities for and the limitations on advancement among verbs of the types given earlier, and they also show the distribution of the occurrence of *with* vs. no chômeur marker.

- 5a. Bob¹ sold the book² to Steve³.
 5b. Bob¹ sold Steve² the book².
 5c. *Bob¹ sold Steve² with the book².
 5d. *Bob¹ sold the book² to Steve³ for Harry^{BEN}.
 5e. *Bob¹ sold the book² for Harry^{BEN}.¹³

- 5f. Bob¹ sold the book² for (=on behalf of) Harry².¹⁴
- 5g. *Bob¹ sold Harry² the book² to Steve³.
- 6a. Harry¹ bought the book² for Elaine^{BEN}.
- 6b. Harry¹ bought Elaine² the book².
- 6c. *Harry¹ bought Elaine² with the book².
- 6d. Harry¹ bought Elaine² with the book^{INSTR}.
- 6e. *Harry¹ bought the book² to Elaine³.
- 6f. *Harry¹ bought the book² to Elaine³ for Alice^{BEN}.
- 6g. *Harry¹ bought Alice² the book² to Elaine³.
- 7a. Louise¹ gave the blouse² to Rick³ for his wife^{BEN}.
- 7b. Louise¹ gave Rick² the blouse² for his wife^{BEN}.
- 7c. *Louise¹ gave Rick² with the blouse² for his wife^{BEN}.
- 7d. Louise¹ gave the blouse² to Rick³.
- 7e. Louise¹ gave Rick² the blouse².
- 7f. *Louise¹ gave Rick² with the blouse².
- 7g. *Louise¹ gave the blouse² for Rick's wife^{BEN}. [9]
- 7h. Louise¹ gave the blouse² for (=on behalf of) Rick's wife[?]. [14]
- 7i. *Louise¹ gave his/Rick's wife² (with) the blouse² to Rick³/him.
- 7j. *Louise¹ gave his wife² (with) Rick² (with) the blouse².
- 7k. *Louise¹ gave Rick² (with) his wife³ (with) the blouse².
- 8a. Cuba¹ supplies arms² to Nicaragua³ for El Salvador^{BEN}.
- 8b. Cuba¹ supplies Nicaragua² with arms² for El Salvador^{BEN}.
- 8c. ?*Cuba¹ supplies Nicaragua² arms² for El Salvador^{BEN}.¹⁵
- 8d. Cuba¹ supplies arms² for El Salvador^{BEN}.
- 8e. Cuba¹ supplies El Salvador² with arms².
- 8f. ?*Cuba¹ supplies El Salvador² arms².
- 8g. *Cuba¹ supplies arms² to Nicaragua³. (Recip. ≠ Benef.) [10]
- 8h. Cuba¹ supplies arms² to El Salvador³. (3 = Recip. = Benef.)
- 8i. *Cuba¹ supplies Nicaragua² with arms² to El Salvador³.^{BEN}
- 8j. *Cuba¹ supplies Nicaragua² arms² to El Salvador³.^{BEN}
- 8k. *Cuba¹ supplies El Salvador² (with) arms² to Nicaragua³.
- 8l. ?*Cuba¹ supplies Nicaragua² arms². (Nicaragua = Recip. ≠ Benef.)
- 8m. *Cuba¹ supplies El Salvador² (with) Nicaragua² (with) arms².
- 8n. *Cuba¹ supplies Nicaragua² (with) El Salvador² (with) arms².

Keeping in mind that an underlying Recipient normally is the initial 3 but a Beneficiary is not, and that if both a Recipient and a Beneficiary are expressed, it is therefore the Recipient which will bear the 3-relation in the initial stratum, and keeping in mind also that a Beneficiary, if it advances to 3 or to 2, can do so only if there is no 3 already present, we can see the following:

1. As noted by Perlmutter and Postal, the *chômeur* marking is not uniform: some verbs take no marker, while others take *with*.

2. The appearance of *with* is not conditioned by the type of argument which advances: with *sell* an underlying Recipient advances without evoking *with* (cf. 5b, 5c), and with *buy* an underlying Beneficiary advances without evoking *with* (cf. 6b, 6c). By contrast, in the case of *supply*, when an underlying Recipient advances it calls forth *with* (cf. 8b, 8c), and the same is true when an underlying Beneficiary advances (cf. 8e, 8f). Thus, neither the advancement of a Recipient nor the advancement of a Beneficiary by itself either requires or prevents the occurrence of *with*, and its appearance is somehow connected with the individual verb.

3. The distribution of the *chômeur* marker *with* in cases of 3→2 ADVANCEMENT is not a specific fact about individual verbs, but is based on the subcategorization of the verb: those verbs which are subcategorized for only one argument (either one) from the pair Recipient/Beneficiary do not take *with*; those verbs which are subcategorized for both arguments and which are Recipient-directed (i.e., which require a Recipient and allow a Beneficiary) also do not take *with*; but those verbs which are subcategorized for both arguments and which are Beneficiary-directed (i.e., which require a Beneficiary and allow a Recipient), regardless of whether the optional Recipient is present, take *with* as their *chômeur* marker. Note that this is not a structural constraint, since *with* must appear even if one of the arguments is missing, cf. 8b/8e, but is, rather, dependent on the subcategorization type. Thus, while 3→2 ADVANCEMENT does have differing side effects with regard to *chômeur* marking, they are not idiosyncratic properties of individual lexical items, but are correlated with subclasses defined by syntactic and semantic properties. The argument against 3→2 ADVANCEMENT based on its purportedly ad hoc nature thus disappears.

No final explanation is advanced here for why just this one subclass should require *with*, but we may speculate a bit about it. Very little has been done in Relational Grammar in the direction of justifying or explaining why advancements or similar relation-changing processes should take place, but it seems probable that at least a large part of the motivation is pragmatic: advancements make arguments more prominent in the sentence by raising them in the hierarchy, i.e., by putting them into a more important slot in the syntactic structure. (This greater prominence can be a response to diverse syntactic and/or semantic stimuli; thus, for

example, in West Greenlandic (Kalaallisut) -- a highly agglutinative and morphologically-oriented language -- there is no explicit way of marking definiteness; a definite meaning can, however, be imparted to noun phrases in certain environments by having them undergo advancement, and, similarly, noun phrases which are in position to receive a definite interpretation can be made indefinite in certain instances by demoting them in the hierarchy.¹⁶⁾ Whatever the exact prominence correlate of advancement as a process or of individual advancement rules may be in English, advancement of an indirect object or of a prepositional phrase to direct object will bring it more into the focus of the verbal action, or, in Jakobson's (1936) terms, will make a central argument out of a peripheral one.

In the case of those verbs like *sell* or *buy* there is no difficulty in choosing which argument is to be advanced, since they take only one argument from the pair Recipient/Beneficiary, whichever one it may be. Similarly, in the case of verbs like *give*, which are Recipient-directed, if some argument is to be advanced it would be natural to choose the Recipient; it is more prominent than the Beneficiary in the semantic structure of the verb, and its syntactic promotion would be in keeping with that fact. In the case of verbs like *supply*, however, which are Beneficiary-directed, the natural choice for being given greater syntactic prominence would be not the Recipient, but the Beneficiary, since it is the Beneficiary which is more prominent in the semantic structure of these verbs. Recall, though, that the Beneficiary can be advanced to 2 only if there is no 3 already present (i.e., if there is no underlying Recipient present); if there is a 3, and if advancement is to take place, then it is the 3 which must be advanced. Thus, the Beneficiary, which is, in some sense, "more deserving" of promotion, is passed over in favor of the Recipient. The price of this syntactic license is that the divergence between the syntactic and the semantic hierarchies of arguments is widened, and it could be that the appearance of *with* is to signal that, in some sense, the "wrong" argument has been promoted by the system.¹⁷

This speculation about the reason for the appearance of *with* aside, the distribution of *with* vs. no marker must in any case be accounted for in a linguistic description of English, and this is true regardless of which linguistic theory or analytical position is accepted. The present discussion has been couched in terms of Relational Grammar, which seems to bring these questions into sharper focus than some other theories, and which provides a convenient means of identifying and discussing the problem, but the answer is given in terms of the semantics and the subcategorization of the verbs involved, and so is for the most part independent of the choice of syntactic theory: *with* occurs as the *chômeur* marker when 3→2 ADVANCEMENT applies to a Beneficiary-directed verb which may also take a Recipient, passing over the Beneficiary and promoting the underlying Recipient (syntactic 3) to 2.

FOOTNOTES

¹ This change in word order is taken as the main feature of the rule in the Transformational analysis, and is fairly clearly what gives rise to the nomenclature "Dative" or "Indirect Object Movement."

² I do not find this example grammatical without *with*, though it somehow does not seem to me to be as bad as 1c, or as corresponding examples with some other verbs which pattern like *supply*, e.g., *provide*, cf. i-iii.

- i. We provided books to the students.
- ii. We provided the students with books.
- iii. *We provided the students Ø books.

For this reason, I have marked it with the notation '?*' instead of just '*'. See also 8c, 8f, and 8l below.

³ Some descriptions of this area of English distinguish between Beneficiary and Recipient arguments, or between Beneficiary phrases and Indirect Objects (or other terminology may be used), while others do not. As will be seen below, such a distinction must be part of an analysis of English.

⁴ An intermediate argument in a chain of Recipient/Beneficiary arguments by its very nature can not be a Beneficiary; thus, while the final argument can be either a Beneficiary or a Recipient, according to the verb involved, an intermediate argument, of which there can be many, can be only a Recipient.

⁵ There are, of course, other possible arguments (e.g., Agent, Patient) which may appear with these verbs and verbs of the other types listed below, but they are not relevant to the present investigation and will be ignored here. Phrases like "take only a Recipient" or "take only a Beneficiary" in the following discussion should be taken as meaning "...from the set Recipient/Beneficiary."

⁶ Another possible way of looking at this situation is that *buy* underlyingly takes as its initial 1 a Recipient, and thus, since the Recipient slot is already occupied, there cannot be another argument in that semantic role. Evidence from ergative languages (e.g., West Greenlandic), however, suggests that the underlying 1 of *buy* is an Agent. The resolution of this question has no consequences for the topic at hand, and the matter will not be pursued further here. The important fact for our purposes is that, for whatever reason, verbs like *buy* cannot have a 3.

⁷ In addition, 3→2 ADVANCEMENT is obligatory with *reward*.

⁸ I have in mind here the reading of 6a on which it is taken at face value, describing a completed episode, and not the reading on which Harry merely intends the book to be for Elaine; cf. also i vs. ii.

- i. Harry bought the book for Elaine, but he gave it to Betty instead.
- ii. Louise gave the blouse to Rick for his wife, but he gave it to Betty instead.

The second clause in i falsifies at least one of the readings of the first clause, but in ii there is no incompatibility between the two clauses.

⁹ This sentence is ungrammatical on the reading where Rick's wife is taken as a Beneficiary argument. There is, however, a grammatical reading of it, cf. 7h below.

¹⁰ This sentence is ungrammatical if Nicaragua is *not* taken as the Beneficiary, i.e., if it is construed only as the Recipient and another Beneficiary is intended. There is a grammatical reading of it if Nicaragua is construed also as the Beneficiary, cf. 8h and the discussion below.

¹¹ This proposal for advancement of a Beneficiary argument, if adopted, along with the fact that advancement of a Beneficiary to 2 discussed earlier can take place only when there is no 3 present, would suggest that the answer to the question about BENEFICIARY ADVANCEMENT raised previously is that it is a 2-part process, involving first BEN→3 and then 3→2, rather than direct advancement of BEN→2. However, see below.

¹² The syntactic relations are arranged, on the basis of several different independent criteria, in a hierarchy, according to which 1s outrank 2s, which outrank 3s; 1s, 2s, and 3s together are classed as *terms*, which as a group outrank all other arguments, which are *non-terms*.

¹³ The sentence is ungrammatical on this reading, with Harry as a Beneficiary. See footnote 9 above, and example 5f below.

¹⁴ It is not clear which argument role *Harry* represents here (or *wife* in 7h below), but it is not a Beneficiary. Its precise nature is not of importance to the present discussion, and so it is marked simply with '?'.

¹⁵ See footnote 2 above. I have no explanation for why these sentences do not seem as bad as the examples with *provide*.

¹⁶ I am indebted to Jerrold Sadock (personal communication) for bringing these facts to my attention.

¹⁷ The function of *with* in these instances, then, may be primarily pragmatic.

REFERENCES

- Channon, Robert. 1978. "Russian and the Rule of 3→2 ADVANCEMENT," in Scatton, E. A., R. D. Steele, and C. E. Gribble, eds., *Studies in Honor of Horace G. Lunt* (=Folia Slavica 2), 54-70.

- Chung, Sandra. 1976. "An Object-creating Rule in Bahasa Indonesia," *Linguistic Inquiry* 7, 41-87.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1965. *Indirect Object Constructions in English and the Ordering of Transformations*. Mouton, The Hague.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1971. "Some Problems for Case Grammar," in O'Brien, R. J., ed., *Report of the Twenty-Second Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*. Georgetown University Press, Washington. 35-56.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1936. "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus," *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 6, 240-288. (Reprinted in Jakobson, *Selected Writings* II. Mouton, The Hague, 1971. 23-71.
- Perlmutter, David M., and Paul M. Postal. 1974. "DATIVE in Universal Grammar." Unpublished paper read at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society, Harvard University.